

UNITED STATE EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVE | NTOR | Α | TTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-------------------------------|-------------|------------------|------|--------------|--------------------|
| 09/513,086 | 02/24/00 | MANSFIELD | | L | MSU 4.1-458 |
| - 021036 MCLEOD & MOYNE | | HM12/0409 | | XAMINER | |
| | | THILLY ON D | | WOITAG | Н, Ј |
| 2190 COMMO | NS PARKWAY | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| OKEMOS MI. | 48864 | | | 1632 | 7 |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: | 04/09/01 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks





Advisory Action

Application No. 09/513,086 Applicant(s)

Mansfield, L.S. et al.

Examiner

Joseph T. Woitach

Group Art Unit 1632



| | E PEr | RIOD FOR RESPON | NSE: [check only a) or b)] | | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | a) [| expires | months from the mailing date of the | e final rejection. | | | |
| | b) 🔀 | expires either three is later. In no ever rejection. | e months from the mailing date of the ent, however, will the statutory period | final rejection, or on the mailing date of for the response expire later than six mo | this Advisory Action, whichever nths from the date of the final | | |
| | date o | on which the response | se, the petition, and the fee have been extension and the corresponding amou | 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed respons filed is the date of the response and also nt of the fee. Any extension fee pursual period for response or as set forth in b) | o the date for the purposes of nt to 37 CFR 1.17 will be | | |
| | Appe perio | llant's Brief is due d for response set | two months from the date of the forth above, whichever is later) | e Notice of Appeal filed on See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CF | (or within any R 1.192(a). | | |
| Ap bu | plicar t is N | nt's response to th OT deemed to plac | ne final rejection, filed on <u>Mar</u> ce the application in condition for | 30, 2001 has been considered allowance: | with the following effect, | | |
| X | The p | proposed amendm | ent(s): | | | | |
| | □ v | vill be entered upo | on filing of a Notice of Appeal and | d an Appeal Brief. | | | |
| | X v | vill not be entered | because: | | | | |
| | X | they raise new i | issues that would require further | consideration and/or search. (See | note below). | | |
| | | • | ssue of new matter. (See note b | | | | |
| | | issues for appea | al. | petter form for appeal by materially | | | |
| | they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | |
| | NOTE: The proposed amendments to claims 4 and 23 change the scope of the claim and raise new 112 second | | | | | | |
| | | paragraph i | issues. | | | | |
| | □ <i>P</i> | Applicant's respons | se has overcome the following re | ejection(s): | | | |
| | New sepa | rly proposed or am rrate, timely filed a | nended claims amendment cancelling the non-al | owable claims. | allowable if submitted in a | | |
| X | | | | | | | |
| | for a | illowance because <u>licants arguments</u> | e: : do not provide evidence or a ne. | been considered but does NOT places to the proportion and discussion with the proportion and discussion and dis | sed antigens already present | | |
| | for a <u>App</u> <u>in th</u> The | illowance because licants arguments ne equid do not pro | e: do not provide evidence or a ne. ovide protection and how the pro it will NOT be considered because | cus to why antibodies to the propo | sed antigens already present ifferently. | | |
| | for a App in th The the | allowance because licants arguments ne equid do not pro affidavit or exhibit Examiner in the fir | e: do not provide evidence or a new revide protection and how the protection and how the protection and how the protection are seen as the considered because the rejection. | xus to why antibodies to the propo posed antigens will function any d | sed antigens already present ifferently. es which were newly raised by | | |
| | for a App in the the | allowance because licants arguments ne equid do not pro affidavit or exhibit Examiner in the fir purposes of Appea | e: do not provide evidence or a new ovide protection and how the protection and how the protection and how the protection and rejection. al, the status of the claims is as the content of | e it is not directed SOLELY to issue follows (see attached written expla | sed antigens already present ifferently. es which were newly raised by nation, if any): | | |
| | for a App in the the For | allowance because licants arguments ne equid do not pro affidavit or exhibit Examiner in the fir purposes of Appea | e: do not provide evidence or a new ovide protection and how the protection and how the protection and rejection. al, the status of the claims is as the content of the cont | e it is not directed SOLELY to issue | sed antigens already present ifferently. es which were newly raised by nation, if any): | | |
| | for a App in the the For Clair | allowance because licants arguments be equid do not pro affidavit or exhibit Examiner in the fir purposes of Appears allowed: | e: do not provide evidence or a ne. ovide protection and how the pro it will NOT be considered because nal rejection. al, the status of the claims is as the | was to why antibodies to the proposed antigens will function any death it is not directed SOLELY to issue follows (see attached written explain | sed antigens already present ifferently. es which were newly raised by nation, if any): | | |
| X | for a Appoin the the the Clair Clair Clair | allowance because licants arguments ne equid do not pro affidavit or exhibit Examiner in the fir purposes of Appea ms allowed: | e: do not provide evidence or a new ovide protection and how the protection and how the protection and rejection. al, the status of the claims is as a state of the claims is a state of the claims in the claims is a state of the claims in the | was to why antibodies to the proposed antigens will function any death it is not directed SOLELY to issue follows (see attached written explain | sed antigens already present ifferently. es which were newly raised by nation, if any): | | |
| X | for a App in the the the Clair Clair The | allowance because dicants arguments allowed: The state of th | e: do not provide evidence or a new ovide protection and how the protection and how the protection and rejection. al, the status of the claims is as the status of the claims is as the protection. | exus to why antibodies to the proposed antigens will function any die it is not directed SOLELY to issue follows (see attached written expland | sed antigens already present ifferently. es which were newly raised by nation, if any): approved by the Examiner. | | |
| X | for a App in the the the Clair Clair The | allowance because dicants arguments allowed: The second arguments | e: do not provide evidence or a new ovide protection and how the protection and how the protection and rejection. al, the status of the claims is as the status of the claims is as the protection. | e it is not directed SOLELY to issue follows (see attached written expla | sed antigens already present ifferently. es which were newly raised by nation, if any): approved by the Examiner. | | |